

Meeting Notes
FGDC Address Subcommittee
April 14, 2021
Webinar

Attendance (30 Total):

Carl Anderson, URISA
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, U.S. Census Bureau
Martin Caballero, U.S. Postal Service
Dave Cackowski, U.S. Census Bureau
Sara Cassidy, U.S. Census Bureau
Megan Compton, State of Indiana
Rodger Coryell, State of New York
Jason Ford, GISinc/U.S. Department of Transportation
Chris Friel, Michael Baker International
John Halverson, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Laura Henderson, U.S. Census Bureau
Ashley Hitt, Connected Nation
Steve Lewis, U.S. Department of Transportation
Phil Markert, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
James Meyer, State of Arizona
Jeremy McMullen, State of Vermont
Donna Pena, State of California
Christopher Portell, FEMA
Raúl Ríos-Díaz, iCasaPR
Richard Robinson, Housing and Urban Development
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Andy Rowan, State of New Jersey
Diane Snediker, U.S. Census Bureau
Jon Sperling, iCasaPR
Thomas Springsteen, HIFLD/Booz Allen Hamilton
Paul Watson, U.S. Census Bureau
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, URISA
Frank Winters, State of New York
Matt Zimolzak, U.S. Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

National Address Database (NAD) Updates, Jason Ford, Steve Lewis (DOT)

- New participants:
 - Kansas – 88 counties out of 105
 - Sioux Falls, SD
 - Grand County, CO – submitted separately from Colorado's state submission.
 - Merced County, CA – the first California county to submit.
 - Dot Lake Tribe (Alaska) – total pop 62
- Now have participation from 33 states
- Iowa now has all but 3 counties participating
- Over 1 million new records added
- Duplicate filtering for AZ reduced number of records, but there is an overall increase from new data from DC and IA
- Steve – thanks to Ken Nelson in Kansas for their new submission, and also first updates in 3 years from IN and IA
- Not sure why Grand, CO submitted separately from CO.
- Release 6 projected release is early May.
- The new duplicate filter found dupes in Arizona and our feedback was provided to them. Thanks to Matt for his assistance to identify the problem.

Puerto Rico Civic Address Vulnerability Evaluation (PRCAVE) Update, Raúl Ríos-Díaz, Jon Sperling (iCasaPR):

- Agenda for discussion:
 - Discuss elements of Puerto Rican style addresses and Federal standards.
 - USPS Pub 28 recognizes Puerto Rican style addresses.
 - Define usage in NENA and FGDC to ensure NAD results.
- Urbanizations are required, and there are special issues with them. It is a critical element of the address.
- Other issues with Puerto Rican style addresses are post-directionals and special Spanish characters
- Urbanization can't just fit into another field. That doesn't solve the issue. Need a unique category for it.
- Urbanization Usage – for Puerto Rico addresses:
 - 33% have an Urbanization
 - 10% are 2-line address
 - 11% are Building addresses
 - 1% have Urbanization as Street Name
 - 24% are Postal Rural
 - 21% Boxes

- Urbanization can't be put into Barrio field. Every address belongs to a barrio, but most people don't know their barrio, but they do know their URB.
- Raúl proposed a position paper for the Address Subcommittee on the unique situations of Puerto Rico addresses.
- Questions –
 - Matt – Can Urbanizations overlap multiple barrios and comunidads?
 - Raul – yes it could happen. Urbanizations are mostly in urban areas.
 - Jon – critical part of address – for distinguishing between addresses.
 - Martin Caballero – yes very possible there is overlap with barriado or barriada. Also barrio could be an indicator of a rural address. There are some addresses that use barrio, but not many.
 - Raul – showing map with overlap of barrio and URB.
 - Ed – suggestion regarding Raúl's suggested position paper – we might think of a Puerto Rico profile of NAD Content Standard or the FGDC Standard. What is unique to Puerto Rico can be applied only in the profile. This would be an officially recognized extension of the standard.

NAD Content Recommendations – Continued Discussion on NSGIC NAD Content Position

- Matt – expressed thanks to NSGIC for content discussion. To summarize where we are, there is a lot of agreement on content itself. A few of the recommendations were highly influenced by one or the other standard—NSGIC's positions on these are important. Most of the place geography is based on the NENA standard. The focus of this discussion is on the recommendations influenced by FGDC standard.
 - How do we handle subaddresses?
 - Matt—the recommendation uses a flexible approach influenced by FGDC that allows for the identification of a broad variety of subaddress types, i.e., slip, boat dock, while the NENA approach is restricted to about 5 types. Do NSGIC stakeholders accept this flexible approach, or the restricted approach? If so, why?
 - Andy Rowan – NENA also has 'seat' as a type. The additional location is a catch all, so the NENA structure doesn't restrict. Sometimes the subaddress could have all the NENA types. How does this compare to the FGDC?
 - Matt – FGDC accommodates each one uniquely by specifying the 'type'.
 - Andy – in an example where a single address record has building, floor, unit, how are these integrated in this structure?
 - Matt – Using an ETL process. Not separate records, but id each type.
 - Ed – No standards are agreed upon for interior space. But we are moving towards Building Information Management and have to

start thinking about this. CLDXF upcoming versions are starting to consider this.

- Matt – differences emphasize the need for flexibility. We will take all subaddress from provider and treat all info provided as equally valid. There is maximum flexibility in the FGDC standard. The NENA standard has 4 types and ‘other’ but doesn’t elevate the ‘other’ to the same level as the 4 types.
- Andy – NENA doesn’t imply that ‘other’ is less valid, it is just not pre-defined. Are subaddress type and identifier non-repeating elements?
- Ed – they are repeating. You can have as many as you need.
- Andy – speaking for NJ, these are doable, but the concern is the transformations. Originally, this issue was raised because all states are using databases that are almost identical to each other and the NAD is different.
- Andy – Somebody has to do the ETL.
- Matt – True it’s not a zero-cost method, but that part of the transformation would be one and done. This method accommodates those that don’t follow the NENA standard.
- Steve – some cost is equal to a lot of cost when you have few resources. Not in favor of doing transformations that aren’t needed. Only two partners are using FGDC and this number is unlikely to grow.
- Matt – not limited to FGDC, likely there will be providers not using any format.
- Ed – when we move to CLDXF 2,3,4, not everyone will move at the same time. What kind of transformations will be needed to handle this?
- Matt – The Subcommittee is not hearing an endorsement of the FGDC subaddress. Is NSGIC endorsing NENA’s subaddress?
 - Andy – yes for efficiency sake.
 - Matt – We will consider this for upcoming vote by Federal stakeholders.
 - Dan – also consider that states play a big role in providing and we are all in this together.
- How do we handle CLDXF2?
 - Ed – Can take the order from the original CLDXF and apply the new attributes from each version of the CLDXF standard. This insulates the internal database design from the changes in newer standards versions. Intended to be extended as needed as CLDXF standard evolves.
 - Matt – This might be moot based on previous discussion. Does NSGIC have anything else to add on CLDXF2?

- Andy – not much to add. This seems to be creating another exchange standard to align with new standards. Reason we are using NENA is because it simplifies the process.
- Matt –We will continue this discussion next time

Next meeting: Wednesday, May 12, 2020 at 11am ET.